DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 325 UD 011 412

TITLE	An Evaluation of the Extended Kindergarten Program.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., N.Y. Center for Field Research and School Services.
SPONS AGENCY	New York State Education Dept., Albany.
PUB DATE	Sep 69
NOTE	90p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Cognitive Development, *Extended School Day, Field Trips, Financial Problems, Intervention, Kindergarten Children, Language Development, Learning Readiness, Multimedia Instruction, *Negro Youth, *Preschool Programs, Preschool Teachers, Program Evaluation, *Puerto Ricans
IDENTIFIERS	*New York City

ABSTRACT

An all-day kindergarten program was established in September, 1968 for three classes of Negro and Puerto Rican children at Public School 101 in the East Harlem area of New York City. The objective of the program was to identify and develop the learning styles of the children through a wide variety of school experiences and exposure to multi-media educational approaches with heavy emphasis on cognitive skills, along with language development and mathematical and social concepts. Auxiliary personnel, special equipment and materials, and trips and other activities for children and parents were to aid in the meeting of these objectives. Funds to support the program were not allocated until March, 1969, leaving only three months of the school year for the program to actually function as planned. Positive outcomes of the program were noted particularly with respect to the degree of parent participation, but it is recommended that funding of subsequent programs of this type take place prior to the onset of the school year in order that well coordinated, carefully organized educational plans be put into effect. (Authors/JM)

ED049325

AN EVALUATION OF THE

EXTENDED KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded by the "New York State Urban Educational Program" enacted at the 1968 Legislative session of the New York State Legislature for the purpose of "meeting special educational needs associated with poverty." (Chapter 685, Section 9, subdivision 12, laws of 1968).

Project Director

Carol Millsom

Center for Field Research
School of Education
New York University
September, 1969

UD 011412

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

School of Education
Center for Field Research and School Services
Office of Off-Campus Courses

51 PRESS BUILDING
WASHINGTON SQUARE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10003
AREA 212 598-2898

September 30, 1969

Dr. J. Wayne Wrightstone
Assistant Superintendent
Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dear Dr. Wrightstone:

In fulfillment of the agreement dated April 16, 1969 between the New York City Public Schools and the Center for Field Research and School Services, I am pleased to submit six hundred copies of an evaluation of The Extended Kindergarten Program.

The Bureau of Educational Research and the professional staff of the New York City Public Schools were most cooperative in providing data and facilitating the study in general. Although the objective of the team was to evaluate a project funded by an Urban Education Grant, this report goes beyond this goal. Explicit in this report are recommendations for modifications and improvement of the program. Consequently, this report will fulfill its purpose best if it is studied and discussed by all who are concerned with education in New York City -- the Board of Education, professional staff, students, parents, lay leaders, and other citizens. To this end, the study team is prepared to assist with the presentation and interpretation of its report. In addition, the study team looks forward to our continued affiliation with the New York City Public Schools.

You may be sure that New York University and its School of Education will maintain a continuing interest in the Schools of New York City.

Respectfully submitted,

Arnold Spinner
Director

AS:fjs

cc: Dean Daniel E. Griffiths

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was made possible through the cooperation of the Board of Education; Dr. Bernard Donovan, Superintendent of Schools; Mr. Jacob Landers, Assistant Superintendent; and Mrs. Rebacca Winton, Director or the Bureau of Early Childhood.

We wish also to express our gratitude to Dr. Murray Ehrlich, Principal, P.S. 101 Manhattan, for his unusually fine cooperation with our many requests.

Our thanks also go to the four kindergarten teachers and their paraprofessional staff members at P.S. 101 Manhattan who so generously gave their time to the evaluation project. We must acknowledge also the contribution of Mrs. McPherson and Mrs. Winfrey, leaders of the extended kindergarten parents' group as well as to all the kindergarten children and their parents.

The cooperation of all of these people with our evaluation efforts is deeply appreciated.

ABSTRACT

An all-day kindergarten program was established in September, 1968 for three classes of Negro and Puerto Rican children at P.S. 101 M in the East Harlem area of New York City. The objective of the program was to identify and develop the learning styles of the children through a wide variety of school experiences and exposure to multi-media educational approaches with heavy emphasis on cognitive skills, along with language development and mathematical and social concepts. Auxiliary personnel, special equipment and materials, and trips and other activities for children and parents were to aid in the meeting of these objectives.

Funds to support the program were not allocated until March 1969, leaving only three months of the school year for the program to actually function as planned. Positive outcomes of the program were noted particularly with respect to the degree of parent participation, but it is recommended that funding of subsequent programs of this type take place prior to the onset of the school year in order that well coordinated, carefully organized educational plans be put into effect.

CONTENTS

	Page
BACKGROUND AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM	1
EVALUATION PROCEDURES	5
THE TEACHERS, CURRICULUM, AND EQUIPMENT	12
PARENT-TEACHER ATTITUDES AND PARTICIPATION	18
THE CHILDREN'S PERFORMANCE	28
SUMMARY	35
APPENDICES	42

THE BACKGROUND AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

The impetus for the extended kindergarten program at P.S. 101M came from a group of parents, committed to quality education, whose children had been enrolled in the fall of 1967 in an all-day pre-kindergarten program at the James Weldon Johnson Community Center in New York City. These parents, convinced that their children had made definite progress as result of that program, expressed concern that these gains would be forfeited if the children were to enter public school kindergarten classes, be exposed to a curriculum repetitious of the earlier one, and be placed with children who had not received previous schooling. For this reason, beginning in 1966 before their children had even entered the pre-kindergarten classes, this parents' group began soliciting the Board of Education and elected officials of the New York City government to provide an enriched all-day kindergarten program. The parents were aided in these efforts by James Weldon Johnson Center personnel.

In the spring of 1968 this parents' committee drew up a proposal for the program, designed for three classes of 20 children, which described its objectives and presented guidelines for the curriculum. It included as well a budgetary request for $67,000 to be allocated for equipment, trips and other activities for parents and children, and the services of a program coordinator, three teachers, three teacher assistants, three teacher aides, three family workers, a family assistant and a secretary. The parents' committee was requested to present this proposal at a hearing of the New York City Board of Estimates. Believing that they had received confirmation that their proposal was to be funded, the parents continued to meet during the summer to formulate further plans for the program, to register children, and to select staff for the available positions.

In August of 1968, however, just weeks before the program was to begin, the committee was informed that it had been operating under a false assumption. Funds were not available. The parents' disappointment was alleviated somewhat when the superintendent of district four agreed, despite the fact that the parents did not live within his district, to

provide classrooms and three teachers for an all-day program at P.S. 101M. In addition, early childhood specialists with the Board of Education assisted the parents in drafting a second proposal for funds to support the special features of the program they had planned which was then submitted to the Office of Urban Education in Albany. A copy of this proposal appears in Appendix A.

From September until March when the requested funds were actually received, the program underwent a number of changes. Approximately 60 children were enrolled in three classes at the beginning of the year, but by the conclusion of the New York City teachers' strike in November, the number had fallen to 27. This attrition may be accounted for in part by the fact that some parents withdrew their children to place them in schools or other programs that were operating during the strike. The greater distance these out of district parents had to travel to bring their children to P.S. 101M may have been another factor.

In any event, the remaining children were grouped together to form one class, while a second all-day class was established by transferring children who were already enrolled in the school's half-day kindergarten classes. Criteria for the selection of children in this second group were varied, but readiness for an all-day program did not appear to be among them. First preference was given to the children of paraprofessionals who worked in the school. Children whose parents had specifically requested that reading be part of the kindergarten curriculum or had expressed a preference for the all-day program for other reasons were also included. A few children were transferred upon the recommendation of teachers who felt their adjustment to the classes in which they were initially placed had not been satisfactory.

Concommitant with these changes in the children enrolled in the program were changes in the staff responsible for its implementation. At the conclusion of the teachers' strike one of the three teachers initially assigned the all-day classes took responsibility for the

children who had been enrolled in September; the second teacher was placed in charge of the newly formed class, while the third teacher divided her time between the two classes. This arrangement was changed, however, in December when one of the teachers resigned. The remaining two were without assistants until February when another teacher was hired.

Further changes occurred when funds to support the program arrived in March. At this time a full complement of paraprofessional teacher aides and family service workers were hired, and one of the original teachers was asked to serve as the program coordinator. Shortly afterward, however, she resigned, and the young woman who had been hired in February took charge of her class. As the position of program coordinator was not filled, two members of the parents' group continued to serve in this capacity, as they had in the past, on a non-paid basis.

The awarding of the funds enabled the parents' committee to place an order for the equipment and materials necessary to implement the program. These were quite badly needed as available supplies had been extremely limited, particularly in the early months of the school year. The requisition which totaled $4,389.95 included expendable materials for classroom and office use, toys and games standard in kindergarten classrooms, as well as typewriters, cameras and audio-visual equipment. The only supplies which were actually received, however, were six puzzles, a calendar, a glove, balls, jump ropes, a few other toys and assorted art materials, totaling $120 in value.

Although the funding was apparently awarded too late in the school year to provide materials and equipment, it did support a variety of trips and other activities for parents and children. Between March 27 and the end of the school year, the children were taken on 17 different bus trips to such places as Chinatown, the Empire State building, Lincoln Center, LaGuardia Airport, the circus, several zoos, museums, and parks, and a variety of ethnic restaurants. Parents were encouraged to accompany children on these trips, and

many did so. In addition, other activities were organized for the parents themselves. These included two dinner and theatre parties.

The parents' committee in planning these activities for children and for adults received no written guidelines concerning the use of the funds, and consequently, operated on the assumption that they could use them in any way they desired. This lack of communication between the parents and the Board of Education resulted in several misunderstandings such as, for example, the committee's request for funds for an end-of-the-year trip for parents to a night club in the Catskills which was rejected by the central board's auditing office on the basis that it was not an educationally related activity. This action resulted in many disappointed parents and the loss of a $100 deposit which had already been paid to the club.

The actual expenditures for the parents' and children's activities are as follows:

Budget Category	Amount Allocated	Amount Spend
Children's Activities (transportation and admissions)	$ 1,500.00	$ 1,091.70
Parents' Activities (including forfeited $100 deposit)	1,800.00	651.40
Special Foods (including trips to ethnic restaurants)	300.00	207.43
	$ 3,600.00	$ 1,950.53

Throughout the school year, the parents' group played a major role in carrying out the program. Although they encountered many obstacles and disappointments, they persevered in their efforts by maintaining frequent and generally harmonious contacts with the teachers, the principal, other school personnel and officials of the Board of Education. In addition they cooperated with the indigenous parents' organization in activities which benefitted the entire school.

THE EVALUATION PROCEDURES

General Guidelines

When the proposal for the extended kindergarten program at P. S. 101, Manhattan, was submitted to the Office of Urban Education in Albany, New York, the New York City Board of Education's Bureau of Educational Research appended a plan for the evaluation of the program. A copy of this plan which appears in Appendix A described data gathering procedures which were to commence in December, 1968, and continue throughout the following school semester. Due to delay in funding the program, however, the contract for its evaluation was not awarded to the evaluating agency, Office for Field Research and School Services, New York University School of Education, until March, 1969. The lateness of this date precluded strict observance of the evaluation procedures outlined by the Bureau of Educational Research. Nevertheless, an effort was made to follow the objectives for the evaluation put forth by the Bureau and summarized below:

1. To describe the program and determine to what extent the blueprint of the project had been implemented.

2. To determine the effectiveness of instruction on the development of cognitive skills, language and concept development.

3. To determine the level of attendance.

4. To determine the effectiveness of teacher performance toward meeting the needs of pupils in the extended kindergarten program.

5. To determine the sufficiency, scope, and appropriateness of instructional materials used for pupils in the extended kindergarten program including those materials which departed from the usual scope and sequence in the regular kindergarten program.

6. To determine the role of supportive staff in the program.

To these six objectives, the New York University evaluation staff added a seventh:

To determine the educational attitudes of the parents of children in the extended kindergarten program and the extent to which parents participated in the planning and implementation of the program and the affairs of the school.

Beginning in April, 1969, and continuing until the end of the school year, a sample was drawn and the evaluation procedures described on the following pages were carried out. It must be recognized, however, that one serious limitation of the present evaluation is the absence of any baseline data to establish the level of performance of the children, parents, or teachers at the beginning of the school year against which to measure changes resulting from the year's program.

The Sample

The Bureau of Educational Research had recommended that the program be evaluated by comparing its classes to those drawn from the regular half-day kindergarten classes in session at the same school. This recommendation was adhered to by randomly selecting two kindergarten teachers from the school roster whose classes then constituted the control group.

The two extended kindergarten classes, the experimental group, contained 39 children (21 in one, 18 in the other). Of these, 17 were boys, 22 were girls, and approximately 74% (29) were Negro. The balance (10) were Puerto Rican.

The percentage of Puerto Rican children in the half-day classes was much higher (52%) which reflected the population of the school in general. Therefore, in order to obtain a comparable number of Negro children in the control group, once the two kindergarten teachers were randomly selected, both their morning and afternoon classes were included. The control group then was drawn from four classes containing a total of 68 children – 30 boys and 38 girls, 35 Puerto Ricans and 33 Negroes.

Interviews were held with 16 parents whose children were in the all-day program and 27 from the half-day classes. This sample represents 41% and 39% respectively of the total population in these two programs. Inclusion in the sample was dependent primarily on the parent's cooperation and availability.

Since the regular kindergarten teachers were randomly selected, no effort was made to match them to the all-day kindergarten teachers in terms of previous years of teaching experience. In actual fact, the two teachers in the experimental program were completing their first and third years of teaching respectively and the teachers in the standard program their third and sixteenth years. The teachers of the control classes were, therefore, more experienced.

The Evaluation Procedures

Teacher-Program Assessment. Members of the evaluation staff, experienced in early childhood education, made three full day visits to each of the four classrooms during the latter part of the school year and recorded their observations on a specially prepared inventory. The teachers and school officials received prior notification of these visits.

In order to insure uniform assessment of these teachers and programs, the observers made their initial visits in pairs, each person making independent evaluations which were then compared and discussed. As agreement between observers seemed high, subsequent visits were made by single individuals. Observers were, however, rotated with the result that each classroom was observed by a minimum of three different persons.

Teacher Interviews. Although informal conversations were held with the four teachers throughout the evaluation period, a formally structured interview was scheduled with each one during the final weeks of the school year. These interviews conducted during the teachers' preparation periods or after school usually required 45 minutes to an hour.

Parent Interviews. Since members of the evaluation staff were frequently in the school and were present at some of the parents' group activities, it was possible for them to talk informally with the parents. In addition to this, interviews approximately 30 minutes in length were held with 43 parents (16 from the experimental and 27 from the standard program) either in their homes or at the school. Letters were sent to all parents informing them of the purpose of the interviews. Those parents who were interviewed in the school were seen after they had brought their children to class. The ones who were interviewed at home were visited at previously scheduled times.

Teacher Ratings. Each of the four teachers was asked to rate all of the children in her class in three areas. These ratings were made at the conclusion of the school year.

Language Assessment. Since language development was one of the major emphases of the extended kindergarten program, it was felt that assessment in this area would provide a reasonable estimate of the educational effectiveness of the program. The children in both the experimental and standard programs were administered two tests during the last weeks of the school year designed to measure language facility. Since the number of Spanish speaking children in the standard program exceeded that in the experimental one, a sample was drawn from among the children who had completed both tests in such a way that the proportion of Spanish speaking children in the two groups was equalized. This sample included 25 Negro and 6 Puerto Rican children from the extended kindergarten program and 21 Negro and 5 Puerto Rican from the standard program.

The two language assessment tests were given at different times, the second following the first by an interval of about two weeks. Each required about 15 minutes per child for administration.

The children were taken one at a time from their classrooms to other vacated rooms in the school for purposes of language assessment. Since they were for the most part

unfamiliar with the adults who were conducting the testing, every effort was made to establish rapport with the children and to help them feel at ease and comfortable in the testing situation. The tape recorders provided one opportunity for accomplishing this. At the beginning of the testing session, each child was encouraged to speak into the microphone giving his own and his teacher's name. These were then played back to him. As a result of this experience, it was believed that the children felt less threatened by the tape recorder which was in use throughout the testing session.

Additional Sources of Date. In addition to the procedures described above, members of the evaluation staff accompanied the experimental classes on trips, attended scheduled parent activities, and spoke informaliy with the principal, assistant principals, and a number of teachers in the school. Meetings were also held to discuss the program with the district superintendent, the early childhood supervisor in the district office, and several persons in the central Board of Education office concerned with financial aspects of funded programs.

Attendance records of children in the experimental and standard programs and the extended kindergarten program's financial records were also examined.

The Instruments

A copy of each of the instruments used in this evaluation appears in the Appendix B; brief descriptions appear below:

Teacher-Program Assessment Inventory. An extensive inventory was employed to assess the teacher and classroom activities in three main areas. The first of these concerned the adequacy of the equipment, physical conditions of the room, and room arrangement. The second focused on the curriculum itself including its intellectual and social-emotional aspects. Finally, the teacher and her relationship to aides, parents, and children were examined. Observers were expected to rate these various aspects on

clearly defined five point scales; space was also provided for qualitative c ›mments.

Parent Interview Schedule. Parents were administered an interview consisting of four sections. The first of these attempted to tap their preferences for the curriculum by asking them which of a list of areas (i.e., reading, getting along with others) they felt were most and least important for their children to learn in kindergarten. In another section, parents were read a series of hypothetical behavior problems believed to be commonplace in kindergarten classrooms and asked not only how they would like a teacher to handle such problems but also how they felt their child's teacher might, in fact, have handled the situation. Other sections dealt with parents' assessment of their children's progress during the school year, their attitudes toward education in general, and the degree of their participation in school affairs.

Teacher Interviews. In order to compare the views of the teachers with those of the parents, the parent interview schedule with certain wording modifications was also administered to them. The teachers were, in addition, asked to discuss their curriculum objectives and to assess their own successes and failures during the school year with respect to the curriculum as well as to discuss their relationships with the classroom aides, the children, and their parents, and the community.

Teacher Ratings. Teachers were asked to rate each child in their class in three areas using a five point scale in which 3 represented the average for children in that class. These areas were English language skills, social-emotional adjustment, and general first grade readiness.

Tests of Language Facility. Two tests of language facility were administered to the children. The first of these, based on the work of Loban[1] and others, was developed on the

[1] Loban, Walter. Problems in Oral English. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1966. NCTE Research Report, number 5.

assumption that children from families of limited education, particularly Negro children, were likely to learn a dialect of English before they learned the standard American speech which they encountered in school. Testing kindergarten children only on their facility with standard English, therefore, presented a limited picture of their general language development. For this reason a test was designed to measure the children's facility with the two language forms. Test consisted on nine sentences presented in both standard English and equivalent dialect forms (i.e., "This girl is a waitress" and "This girl she be waitress"). These 18 sentences were listed in random order and read and recorded by a Negro familiar with the two language forms. The children were asked to listen to each sentence and immediately afterward repeat it as accurately as they could to the experimenter. The children were scored on the accuracy of their reproduction of certain constructions within each sentence. These constructions included forms with which children frequently have difficulty such as plurals, subject-verb agreement, and verb tenses. Each child received two scores for correct reproductions, one in standard English and the other in the dialect.

In addition to this test of language usage, a second was also administered, the purpose of which was to obtain a measure of the children's spontaneous language. The cards of the Children's Apperception Test which depict animals in familiar situations were used as a stimulus. Each child was shown a card and asked to describe what was happening. To prompt further speech, the child was asked, "What happened before that?" and "What happened after that?" He was given no additional prompting. The child's response to the first card was not recorded. Beginning with the introduction of the second card, however, the tape recorder was switched on, and the time was noted. The child was encouraged to talk for the next ten minutes by the examiner presenting a new picture whenever the child appeared to have said all that he wanted to about the previous one. At the end of the ten minute period, the test was concluded.

Scoring was a simple word count, the total number of words spoken by the child during the allotted time period.

THE TEACHERS, THE CURRICULUM, AND THE EQUIPMENT

The teachers as well as everyone else who participated in the evaluation were assured that they would remain anonymous in the final written report. Since there were only four teachers, particular care must be taken in reporting their activities in the classroom or their interview responses lest their identity be revealed to readers closely associated with the program. For this reason documented comparisons between the extended and regular kindergarten teachers will be avoided here.

The observers noted considerable diversity among the styles of the four teachers making generalizations about them as a group very difficult. The programs they conducted ranged from one which was traditional, teacher centered, and quite structured to another which was relatively more child centered, unstructured, and individualized. The teachers themselves varied from those who seemed comfortable and at ease in their roles to others who still acquiring this assurance. Although none of the teachers were judged unsatisfactory and examples of good teaching were found in every classroom, the evaluation staff felt that most of the teachers could individualize their curriculum to a greater extent and in some cases needed to tailor it more specifically to the level of the children's understanding. A page from one observer's report will illustrate this point:

> The children are assembled for a group discussion which the teacher introduces by asking, "What season is this?" To which the children correctly respond, "Summer." She then proceeds to ask "What do we do in the summer on a hot day like this?" The children reply by saying, "Go South", "Go to Puerto Rico," the things they do in the summer, but these are not the answers the teacher is looking for. She wants them to say "Go to the beach" which is very likely not part of their experience. After several minutes in which the children try to guess what the teacher has in mind, one child says, "Go swimming." The teacher is very pleased, explains

that we go swimming at the beach and presents several boxes of shells and rocks which she has collected there . . . . . She selects two clam shells, holds them together and the following dialogue ensues:

> Teacher: A little animal lived in here once.
> Child (amazed): What kind of animal?
> Teacher: A clam.
> Child (not comprehending): What kind of animal?
> Teacher: A clam.
> Child: A clam-animal?
> Teacher: Yes, a clam.

Since no picture of a clam is presented, this child has no understanding of what it is and possibly imagines it to be like the fourlegged animals with which he he is acquainted.

There were other examples, however, of activities which had been planned with the children's point of view in mind:

> The teacher notices that a few children during free play are amusing themselves by casting shadows on an area of the floor where the sun is shining. She goes over to the group and begins a discussion with them, pointing out how sunshine is necessary for shadows. This she demonstrates by adjusting the window shade saying, "Look what happens when I lower the shade. How much room will there be for shadows if I raise the shade?"
>
> One boy runs over to assist with the raising and lowering of the shade, while the other children give him directions. They continue to make shadows for several minutes, quite delighted with the activity.
>
> The teacher mentioned to me later that she planned to repeat the activity the next day if the sun was not shining. This way she hoped the children would come to understand the relation between sun and shadows.

The purpose of observing the teachers in their classrooms, of course, was to compare the competency of the teachers in the experimental program with that of the teachers randomly selected from the regular classes. Although it was difficult to make quantitative judgments about teachers who were so qualitatively different, it was the consensus of the evaluation staff that there was no substantial difference between the groups in terms of over-all competency.

In addition to observing the teachers' skills, the evaluation staff was also interested in learning more about the nature of the curriculum presented in the two programs. The following summary from observers' reports of the activities which took place one day in June gives some indication of the content areas covered in the two programs.

Schedule for Extended Kindergarten Program

9:00 Attendance taking – children counting those boys and girls present and absent.

9:15 Milk.

9:35 Reading words and sentences on the board as a group.

9:45 Individual groups – one working with cuisenaire rods; the other printing words on slates.

10:00 Free play.

10:15 Individual work with children using envelopes of words they have already learned and those they want to learn.

10:30 Clean-up and trip to bathroom.

10:40 Learning meaning of concepts "Up" and "Down" and practicing reading and writing these words using teacher-made materials.

10:55 Lunch.

11:40 Number exercises on blackboard using number line. ("What number comes after 7?" "7 + 1 is what?")

11:55 Drawing pictures for Father's Day and writing titles on the pictures.

12:10 Small groups of children take turns working with cuisenaire rods while others continue with Father's Day project.

1:00 Clean up and trip to bathroom.

1:10 Singing Songs.

1:40 Reading teacher-made books composed of stories children have told in class.

1:50 Alphabet game – "Who can give me a word starting with S?"

2:00 Milk and crackers.

2:10 Distributing homework sheets reviewing work covered during the day.

2:20 Dismissal.

Schedule for Regular Kindergarten Program

9:00 Group discussion of the day's weather.

Roll Call – each child responds by reciting his address and telephone number.

Counting of children present and writing on blackboard names of children absent.

Letter exercise – find me the name with two e's.

Review of days of week using flash cards; practice writing June on board.

9:40 Art activity – drawing picture of the American flag.

10:20 Free play.

10:50 Milk and crackers

11:05 Reading story to class followed by child reading story.

11:20 Clean up.

11:25 Dismissal.

It can be seen by examining these schedules that the difference between the programs was primarily the amount of time spent on various content areas rather than the nature of the content itself. All four of the teachers commented that although they considered social-emotional development the major objective of kindergarten, they did spend more time on reading and number readiness activities than on any other content areas. Art and music activities were heavily stressed also. Several of the classrooms had science table displaying skills, nests, and seeds, but apart from growing plants most teachers felt that

they had rather neglected this area of the curriculum. Social studies also received less emphasis and was primarily confined to discussions of the neighborhood and community workers. Such discussions were greatly enhanced, of course, in the case of the extended program by bus trips to various parts of the city and meals in ethnic restaurants. Negro and Puerto Rican culture which might be seen as part of a social studies curriculum was treated with varying degrees of importance in the four classes, but nowhere did it receive much emphasis. Most teachers included ethnic songs in their programs and made available to the children books about Negro and Puerto Rican families; others, in addition, displayed pictures of minority group leaders and children on bulletin boards.

When the teachers were asked in which curriculum area they felt they had had the most success, the majority indicated the expressive arts. Reading and number readiness were areas in which many felt they had not been as successful as they had hoped. Some of the teachers mentioned uncertainty about the best procedures for introducing this material as a reason for their relative lack of success; others, particularly those in the half-day program, believed lack of time to be a factor. Several teachers explained that they planned to work with smaller groups within the class next year in order to individualize the reading and number readiness curriculum to a greater extent and were hopeful that this procedure would yield better results.

None of the teachers interviewed followed any particular curriculum guide although they were familiar with those developed by the Board of Education or by others. The teachers of the extended classes were fully acquainted with the curriculum recommendations drawn up by the parents' committee and where possible had attempted to incorporate them. Certain recommendations, however, such as map reading, and counting to 100, they felt were inappropriate for children at this level. The parents apparently accepted this decision.

Teachers of the extended classes were enthusiastic about the value of a full-day program for kindergarten children. It was their feeling that the bus trips were of particular

value although they also admitted that the frequency of these trips within a limited time period may have precluded their being intergrated into the curriculum as fully as could be desired. The availability of paraprofessional assistants in the classroom which the special funds provided were also regarded by these teachers as an asset.

The teachers who were not associated with the experimental program were less enthusiastic about its merits. They were more inclined to believe that a full-day program would be suitable for some five year olds, but not all. The bus trips and additional paraprofessional assistants available in the program were, however, seen as desirable by these teachers.

Although the nature of the curriculum and the competency of the teachers did not vary substantially between the two programs, the availability of facilities, equipment, and materials did. The half-day classes were in rooms which had sinks and toilet facilities whereas those assigned to the all-day classes did not. Art materials, table games, puzzles, and other standard kindergarten equipment was in less generous supply in these classes as well. The evaluation staff did not feel, however, that these shortages were severe enough to seriously jeopardize the implementation of a standard kindergarten program, but they did prevent some of the special features of the experimental program from being carried out. Certain of the proposed language arts activities, for example, required the use of a tape recorder which was not available. The lack of food transportation and refrigeration equipment specified by the Health Code prevented the children from eating their lunches in their classrooms as was planned. As discussed in the first section of this report, the equipment ordered in March to implement these kinds of activities never arrived.

PARENT-TEACHER ATTITUDES AND PARENT PARTICIPATION

In order to learn more about parent participation and parent-teacher attitudes, interviews were conducted with all four teachers and 43 parents (16 from the extended program and 27 whose children were in the regular classes). The evaluation staff also had the opportunity to talk informally with members of the extended program parents' committee and to observe their interaction with the teachers in a variety of situations.

Parent-Teacher Attitudes

Believing that congruence in the attitudes of parents and teachers concerning the the educational program is an important factor in its success, the evaluation staff attempted to tap these attitudes in three main areas: curriculum emphasis, handling of behavior problems and education in general.

Curriculum Emphasis. In the first section of the interview parents and teachers were presented with a list of seven areas of curriculum emphasis generally regarded as appropriate in kindergarten. They were asked to select the ones which they regarded as most important and second most important for their children to learn. Having made this choice, they were also asked to indicate the areas which were least and second least important. The following table indicates the number of times each area was selected and presents a weighted score for each area with respect to its importance and lack of importance. This score was obtained by multiplying by two the number of first choices and adding to that the number of second choices. This procedure was repeated for the least important and second least important choices. It should be noted, however, that not every parent gave all four choices.

A. Choices Made by 15 Extended Kindergarten Parents

Area	Number Times Chosen As:			Number Times Chosen As:		
	Most Important	Second Most Important	Weighted Score	Second Least Important	Least Important	Weighted Score
Learning to Read	10	2	22	0	1	2
Learning about Numbers	0	3	3	3	1	5
Learning to Get Along with Other Children	2	1	5	0	2	4
Learning to Paint, Sing, and Dance	0	2	2	0	5	10
Learning How to Behave in School	2	2	6	4	0	4
Learning How to Say New Words and to Speak Well	1	3	5	2	1	4
Learning About Science	0	2	2	1	2	5

Examination of these tables indicates that parents whose children were in the extended classes overwhelmingly regarded learning to read as the most important aspect of the kindergarten curriculum. The other group of parents placed about equal emphasis on reading and learning to get along with other children. Both groups agreed that painting, dancing, and singing were least important. The teachers, on the other hand, typically considered the social-emotional areas – learning how to behave in school and how to get along with others – as the most important areas and the academic areas of reading and numbers as least essential.

B. Choices Made by 27 Regular Kindergarten Parents

Area	Number Times Chosen As:			Number Times Chosen As:		
	Most Important	Second Most Important	Weighted Score	Second Least Important	Least Important	Weighted Score
Learning to Read	11	4	26	1	1	3
Learning about Numbers	0	5	5	3	2	7
Learning to Get Along with Other Children	11	6	28	3	0	3
Learning to Paint, Sing, and Dance	0	0	0	2	14	30
Learning How to Behave in School	3	6	12	5	2	9
Learning How to Say New Words and to Speak Well	2	4	8	2	3	8
Learning about Science	1	3	5	4	5	14

This apparent conflict was most evident in the extended kindergarten and the teachers and most parents associated with that program were aware of this. About 25% of these parents and an equal percentage in the other group believed that too little time had been spend on reading during the year. Informal conversations with the extended kindergarten parents, however, indicated that they did not necessarily hold the teachers responsible for this failure. Instead, they felt that the lack of special equipment, shortages of books and other materials, as well as too few paraprofessional assistants to provide individualized instruction were reasons why more time had not been spent on reading.

The teachers associated with this program felt that by the end of the year they had come to see more value in a reading program at the kindergarten level than they had previously. One, however, made an important point in this connection when she said that since the idea

C. Choices Made by Four Kindergarten Teachers

Area	Number Times Chosen As:			Number Times Chosen As:		
	Most Important	Second Most Important	Weighted Score	Second Least Important	Least Important	Weighted Score
Learning to Read	0	0	0	0	3	6
Learning about Numbers	0	0	0	3	0	3
Learning to Get Along with Other Children	4	0	8	0	0	0
Learning to Paint, Sing, and Dance	0	0	0	1	0	1
Learning How to Behave in School	0	3	3	0	0	0
Learning How to Say New Words and to Speak Well	0	1	1	0	0	0
Learning about Science	0	0	0	0	1	2

of reading at this level was relatively new, many kindergarten teachers were a bit uncertain how to proceed with such instruction.

The differences in curriculum emphases expressed by teachers and parents in these kindergarten classes were not serious enough to jeopardize the harmonious relations which typically prevailed. Nearly every one of the parents in the two programs gave the teachers very high over-all ratings. This conflict did however, indicate the need for greater teacher-parent discussion of these matters and perhaps also suggested that kindergarten teachers need to receive more help in designing reading programs for children in their classes.

Controling Behavior Problems. The parents were also presented with a series of hypothetical behavior problems which might occur in a kindergarten classroom and

asked how they would recommend these be handled by the teacher and whether or not their child's teacher would have handled the matter in this way. The teachers were given the same problems and asked comparable questions.

Differences between the recommendations given by the teachers and parents were greater when the behavior problems concerned agression, sex play, or use of socially unacceptable language than when they involved dependency or shyness on the part of the child. Typically parents suggested firmer disciplinary action than did teachers for "acting-out" behavior such as that described in the following episode:

> Tom is always fighting. He is bigger than the other children and seems to frighten them with his loud talk and rough manner. One day, the teacher sees Tom hit another child and goes over to talk to him. When the teacher asks Tom what he is fighting about, Tom answers, "Nothing", and kicks the teacher in the leg.

Approximately 40% of the parents in both groups recommended that the teacher notify Tom's parents about his behavior. Others suggested in addition or instead that Tom be sent to the principal or otherwise physically removed from the group, or be made to stand or sit to watch the others until he asked to re-join them. A few parents felt Tom should be expelled from school or hit by the teacher. Talking constructively to the child about his actions was preferred by about 12% of the parents.

The teachers themselves were in agreement with this last recommendation. As one teacher said,

> I would ask Tom to sit down. When he felt better and I had calmed down, I would talk to him about what happened. My purpose would be for him to understand how children and teachers feel when someone hits them by asking Tom how he would feel if someone hit him.

The teachers were all aware that many parents did not share their opinions about the handling of certain behavior problems. As one teacher said when asked how parents would want her to respond in the episode with Tom:

> The parents want firmer discipline. Although it depends on the parent, some might not even object if I hit the child. I would never do that. I believe my methods work best in the long run, but some parents are not convinced.

It is interesting to note, however, that parents, in the interview situation at least, less often indicated awareness that teachers would handle problems differently. When asked whether the teacher would have done what they suggested or followed a different procedure, the parents overwhelmingly said the teacher's methods would be the same as theirs. One hypothesis that might be offered to explain this apparent contradiction is that when parents regard the teacher favorably, as these parents did, they believe her disciplinary measures are the same as theirs even when in fact they are not.

In any event, the interview responses indicated another area of potential conflict between teachers and parents. Although the teachers rarely mentioned contacting parents as a means of handling any of the hypothetical behavior problems, the parents frequently did so. This of course should not be construed to mean that the teacher never actually consulted with the parents about problems such as these. They did. Perhaps the teachers were responding to these hypothetical situations as isolated incidents. Consulting with the parents may have been done only when the undesirable behavior was repeated. Parents, however, appear to be expressing a desire for more frequent consultation.

As with the differences of opinion concerning the curriculum, these differences in recommendations for handling behavior problems did not create any serious disruptions in teacher-parent relations, but they did suggest the need for greater discussion between teachers and parents. Many of the films depicting behavior problems which have been designed for discussion purposes might be a useful focus for such occasions.

Attitudes toward Education. In an effort to locate possible teacher-parent differences in attitudes toward education both were asked to respond to ten items drawn from a questionnaire designed for administration to parents of Head Start children in the 1968 national

evaluation of that program. The responses to these items can be scored on a five point scale from (1) strongly agree to (5) strongly disagree. The average scores for the parents in both programs and the teachers appears in the following table:

Mean Responses of Teachers and Parents to Educational Attitude Items *

	Extended Kindergarten Parents n = 16	Half-Day Kindergarten Parents n = 27	Teachers n = 4
1. Most teachers probably like quiet children better than active ones.	3.46	2.66	2.50
2. As a parent there is very little I can do to improve the schools.	4.26	4.88	4.75
3. Most teachers do not want to be bothered by parents coming to see them.	3.96	3.96	3.00
4. In school there are more important things than getting good grades.	2.93	2.74	1.25
5. The best way to improve the schools is to train teachers better.	2.33	2.56	2.50
6. Once in a while it should be OK for parents to keep their children out of school to help out at home.	4.66	4.00	2.75
7. Teachers who are very friendly are not able to control the children.	3.53	3.74	4.00
8. The teachers make the children doubt and question things that they are told at home.	3.80	3.33	2.50
9. When children do not work hard in school, the parents are to blame.	3.73	2.78	2.50
10. Most children have to be made to learn.	3.86	2.85	4.50

* The higher the mean, the greater the disagreement with the item as stated.

Although it is difficult to make any general statements on the basis of such a small sample, the items which reflect the greatest difference in opinion between parents and teachers are numbers 3, 4, 6, 8, and 9. Some of these items may reflect the areas of disagreement previously discussed, although it should be noted that those interviewed were asked to respond by thinking of parents, teachers, and schools in general not just the ones with whom they were specifically acquainted. Nevertheless, it may be seen that teachers are somewhat more likely than parents to agree that teachers do not want parents coming to see them (# 3) and are also more likely than the extended program parents to say that parents are to blame for school failures (#9). The greater emphasis placed by parents on academic subject matter at the kindergarten level may be reflected here in the parents' stronger contention that getting good grades is important in school (# 4), and that keeping children out of school to help at home is unacceptable (# 6).

Parents and teachers appear to be in quite close agreement that parents can help to improve the schools (# 2), that schools could be improved by better teacher training (# 5), and that friendly teachers can control their classes (# 7).

Certain differences can also be noted between parents whose children were in the extended program and those whose children attended the regular classes. The former group were more likely to disagree that teachers prefer quiet children (# 1), that it is occasionally all right to keep children out of school to help out at home (# 6), that parents are to blame for school failure (# 9), and that children must be made to learn (# 10). It is difficult to know what factors account for these differences in parent attitudes, but it is interesting to note that in these four instances of disagreement, the position of the half-day group is closer to that of the teachers.

Parent Participation

Believing that parent participation in the educational process is essential, the evaluation staff collected information concerning the parents' contact with the teacher and involvement in other aspects of school affairs.

Teacher-Parent Contacts. The parents who were interviewed were asked how many times during the school year they had seen their child's teacher. The responses of the two groups are as follows:

Number of Times Parents Reported Seeing Teacher

Frequency	Extended Program		Half Day Program	
	Number	%	Number	%
Never	0	0	0	0
Once	3	18.8	2	8
Twice	1	6.3	3	12
3-5 times	4	25.0	6	24
6-10 times	5	31.3	3	12
More than 10 times	3	18.8	11	44

There appears to be no essential difference between the two groups of parents with respect to frequency of teacher contacts. It must be recognized, however, that this question may have meant different things to different parents. Some may have considered only teacher-parent conferences in giving their answer, while other may have reported such informal contacts as greeting the teacher when bringing the child to school. It was the impression of the evaluation staff that the extended kindergarten parents had more intensive contact with their children's teachers, but there is no concrete evidence to this point.

Participation in School Affairs. Although differences between the extended and half day parents with respect to most topics covered in this section were small, the differences in their degree of participation in school affairs was marked. When asked how many school meetings or activities they had attended, the average number for the regular kindergarten parents was .95 in contrast to the average of 3.45 for the parents in the extended program.

This finding is not surprising in view of the fact that the extended program was initiated by parents and that, in part by necessity, they had to participate in many aspects of its implementation. All of the children's trips and similar activities were arranged by the parents as were the activities for the parents themselves. In addition to this, however, two of the parents in particular were involved in nearly every aspect of the program including contacting officials of the Board of Education and the State Education Department concerning procedural aspects of funding arrangements, soliciting books for the program from publishers, and arranging conferences with the teachers concerning the program's progress. It is particularly noteworthy that the participation of these parents extended beyond the kindergarten program itself to activities which involved the entire school. These included publishing a school newspaper, organizing fund raising projects, and arranging Saturday movies for all children in the neighborhood.

In the spring of the school year, the parents' group began drafting a proposal to secure funds for an enriched first grade program for the children who had completed the all-day kindergarten.

THE CHILDREN'S PERFORMANCE

Language Development

Believing that language skills play an important role in subsequent school achievement, the parents' committee recommended that a strong emphasis be placed on the acquisition of these skills in the extended kindergarten program. For this reason the evaluation staff chose to consider language development as the measure of the children's progress in this program. One severe limitation in this procedure, however, is that no information was available concerning the level of the children's language development or their achievement in any other area at the beginning of the school year. The tests of language development reported here were administered in May and June to the half-day and extended kindergarten class on the somewhat doubtful assumption that any differences between the groups evident at that time would reflect their educational experiences of the past year. It must also be fully recognized, however, that the language development of the groups may not have been equivalent in September.

The Testing Procedures

The methods for assessing language development are more fully outlined in the first section of this report which describes the procedures and instruments employed in the evaluation of the program. A brief summary appears here.

1. Familiarity with Non-standard and Standard American Language Forms.

The fact that most tests of language development administered to young children are scored on the basis of proficiency with standard English forms handicaps the performance of Negro children who although deficient in this respect may have considerable language facility in their own dialect. For this reason a test was administered which enabled the children to demonstrate their skill in both language forms. A series of 18 recorded sentences was presented one at a time to the children who were asked to repeat them exactly as they had

heard them. This series consisted of nine sentences of varying complexity in standard English interspersed with nine direct translations of these sentences into Negro dialect. The children received two scores, one on standard English and the other on dialect, based on the correctness with which they repeated certain constructions in these sentences.

2. Language Fluency. A second test was administered which required the child to describe what was happening in a series of pictures. The child's responses were scored in terms of the number of words spoken within a 10-minute interval irrespective of coherency or grammatical correctness.

The following are examples of the children's responses:

To a picture of a tiger chasing a monkey in a jungle:

a. Monkey is climbing up on a tree, and the tiger is jumping down from the tree. The flowers is all over the floor.

b. The tiger is going to grab-the tiger is going to scratch the monkey. And the monkey's gonna go down, and I see a cane. The tiger got mad. He gonna fall in a hole.

c. A tiger. A tiger open his mouth.

To a picture of chicks eating at a table with a hen in the background:

a. The chickens. They eat – they ate all their breakfast, and then they had to wash the dishes and da bowl.

b. The little ducks is eating. They eating cereal and meat. They eat up everything so they be nice and strong. Then they gonna take a nap.

c. Two baby chicks were eating their dinner. And the baby chicks said "I like you, Momma. That's nice dinner." And the baby chicks were looking sad and the baby chick had the spoon in his hand and the plate were all clean up. He didn't have no food in his plate. Momma had a whole buncha dishes in there, and Momma said, "We are going to save it for later."

3. Teachers' Ratings. In addition to these tests, further information was obtained from the teachers who were asked to rate the children's facility with spoken English and their general readiness for first grade on a five-point scale.

Results

1. Intercorrelations of Measures. The intercorrelations of these various measures of language facility presented in the table below contain interesting information about this aspect of children's language development.

Ideally one would hope to see a positive and significant correlation between the scores for familiarity with standard and non-standard English constructions as this would indicate that the children had similar competency with both language forms. The high, negative correlation (–.73) which was obtained, however, demonstrates that this is not the case. Children who were proficient with standard English lack this proficiency with dialect, but more importantly for subsequent school achievement, those who could repeat sentences accurately after hearing them spoken in dialect were much less successful when the same sentences were presented in standard English.

The high correlation between teachers' ratings of language skill and first grade readiness (.74) suggests that teachers regard language as an important predictor of school success, but their criterion appears to be facility with standard English. The evidence for this statement is provided by the positive correlations between standard English scores and language and readiness ratings (.27 and .45 respectively) and the negative relationship between proficiency in non-standard English and these same ratings (both –.31).

The correlations with language fluency further illustrate this tendency on part of the teachers when it is recalled that the fluency score was a measure of the number of words spoken during a ten-minute interval irrespective of the appropriateness of their usage. Many of the responses of the children did contain language that was not strictly standard English as the examples previously presented illustrate.

Intercorrelations of Measures of Language Development

	Familiarity with Standard English Constructions	Familiarity with Non-Standard English Constructions	Language Fluency	Teachers' Ratings of Language Skill	Teachers' Ratings of First Grade Readiness
Familiarity with Standard English Constructions	–	−.73**	.16	.27*	.45**
Familiarity with Non-Standard English Constructions		–	.32*	−.31*	−.31*
Language Fluency			–	.27*	.01
Teachers' Ratings of Language Development				–	.74**
Teachers' Ratings of First Grade Readiness					–

(** significant at .01 level; *significant at .05 level for sample size of 57 children)

It will be noted that proficiency with non-standard English is significantly correlated with fluency while with standard scores are not. More interesting, however, are the correlations between teachers' ratings and fluency. Although there is a significant relationship between fluency and ratings of language skill, there is no relation at all between how much the child talks in the testing situation, at least, and judgments of his first grade readiness. The correctness of his speech from the point of view of standard English, however, is related to these predictions as previously mentioned. It may be that teachers in their concern with appropriateness of language usage are underestimating the importance of fluency as a factor in the child's language development.

2. Comparisons between Groups. Since the extended kindergarten program included among its objectives a particular emphasis on language development, one measure of the

effectiveness of this program is the language skill of the children enrolled in contrast to that of the ones in the regular, half-day classes. Comparisons were made by performing t tests on the group means for three measures of language development. Results appear in the following table:

Results of t tests Performed on Means for Extended and Regular Kindergarten Classes on Three Measures of Language Development

	Means			
	Extended	Regular	t value	
Language Fluency	235.61	179.69	2.11	.05 (two tailed test)
Familiarity with Standard English	12.03	10.27	1.91	.10 (two tailed test)
Familiarity with Non-Standard English	14.35	13.42	1.15	not significant

The children in the all-day classes spoke a significantly greater number of words during the testing period than did their counterparts in the half-day classes. Although the differences are less marked, the familiarity with standard English demonstrated by members of the extended classes is also greater. No differences were obtained with respect to non-standard usage.

These findings would appear to indicate that the extended kindergarten program had been successful in promoting the language development of its students beyond the level attained by children in standard programs. Such a conclusion, however, is extremely tenuous. Since baseline data are lacking, it cannot be assumed that these two groups were equivalent with respect to language development at the beginning of the school year. There is some evidence, in fact, which would argue that they were not equivalent. More of the children in the extended program than in the standard one had been enrolled in pre-kindergarten

programs. Furthermore, the extended kindergarten parents who gave so unstintingly of their time and energy in implementing this special program may have placed greater value on the benefits of education than other parents in the community. Consequently, their children may have been exposed to richer educational experiences within the home. The language superiority of the children in the all-day kindergarten, then, may perhaps be accounted for by factors such as these rather than by the nature of the program in which they were enrolled.

There are two other findings concerning language development in this study which may be of interest to educators. A comparison was made between the two all-day classes on basis of the language scores. Although no difference was noted concerning standard and non-standard English usage, there was a tendency which approached statistical significance ($t=1.77$, $p=.10$, two tailed test) for the children in one of the classes to be more fluent than those in the other. This was also the class in which the teacher stressed to a greater extent small group activity and informal discussions. No causal connection can be established on basis of the data collected in this study, of course, but the finding is at least suggestive of the importance of providing children with informal opportunities for talking among themselves.

A second finding of interest to educators concerns the results of the test of familiarity with standard English which required the children to replicate certain language constructions. Of the seven which were scored, past tense verbs, the copulative verb in the present tense, and the possessive were most frequently repeated correctly. More difficulty, however, was encountered with respect to plurals, noun-verb agreement in the third person, and if-did constructions. Recognition of the types of errors made by children in acquiring standard English is useful to teachers in guiding their progress.

Attendance

In addition to assessing language development as a measure of the effectiveness of the experimental program, attendance figures were also considered on the assumption that they provided a limited measure of the attitudes of children and parents toward the benefits of education and their satisfaction with the school experience. Parental attitudes are particularly reflected in the attendance of kindergarten children as school enrollment is not legally required at this level. Moreover, when five year olds do attend school, inner-city parents frequently find it necessary to escort them themselves or to make arrangements for others to do so.

In order to compare the attendance figures for the full-day and regular kindergarten classes, the six-week period, March 10 – April 18, was arbitrarily selected. As a rough control on factors such as weather conditions which affect attendance, only the figures for the morning classes were used in making this comparison.

By dividing for each class the total number of absences by the number of days on which classes were held during that six-week period, the following percentages were obtained:

Extended Classes	9.9% absence
Morning Classes	13.9% absence

These figures indicate that attendance in the extended classes is somewhat superior to that in the half day sessions. This is particularly interesting in view of the fact that children enrolled in the extended classes lived outside the school district and had to commute a greater distance. These figures may have indicated a greater motivation on the part of the extended kindergarten parents to bring their children to school or may have been the result of greater enthusiasm on part of the children to come to school.

SUMMARY

Background of the Program

During the academic year of 1967-1968, a group of East Harlem parents whose children were attending a community center pre-kindergarten program petitioned various New York City and Board of Education officials to provide an enriched, all-day kindergarten program for their children. These parents, firmly committed to quality education, believed that the standard kindergarten curriculum would be too repetitious for their children as result of their previous school experience. In the spring of 1968 these parents received an unverified report that funds were available for such a program. Operating under this assumption, they proceeded during the summer to interview applicants for professional and paraprofessional positions and continued to plan the curriculum. Their objective was a program in which children's learning styles would be "identified and developed through a wide variety of school experiences and exposure to multi-media educational approaches with heavy emphasis on cognitive skills along with language development and mathematical and social concepts."[1]

Shortly before the 1968-1969 academic year began, however, the parents were informed that they had acted on inaccurate information and that funds were not available. Their disappointment was alleviated somewhat when the superintendent of district four agreed, even though the parents were outside of his district, to provide classrooms and three teachers for the all-day kindergarten program at P. S. 101 M. Approximately 60 Negro and Puerto Rican children were then enrolled, and Board of Education personnel assisted the parents' group in re-formulating their original proposal for submission to the New York State Department of Education to secure needed funds.

At the conclusion of the teachers' strike in November, however, the number of children enrolled in the program had fallen to about 27. These children were grouped in one

---

1 from the proposal submitted to the Office of Urban Education, Albany, N. Y.

class, while a second all-day class was formed, composed of children previously enrolled in regular kindergarten classes at P. S. 101 M.

In March, funds were allocated to support the program. As a result, six paraprofessional staff members were employed, materials and supplies were ordered, and trips for the children as well as activities for the parents were scheduled for the remaining months of the school year. The position of program coordinator was not filled; therefore, members of the parents' group served in this capacity, as they had in the past, on a non-paid basis.

Evaluation Procedures

In March, 1969, the Office of Educational Research of the New York City Board of Education contracted New York University to evaluate this all-day kindergarten program. Upon the recommendation of that office, the two all-day classes were contrasted to two control classes randomly selected from the regular kindergarten classes at P. S. 101.

Beginning in April, the following evaluation procedures were undertaken:

1. Three full day observations were made in each of the four classrooms (two all day and two half day) in an effort to evaluate the teachers' interactions with the children, aides, and parents as well as the nature of the curriculum.

2. Interviews were conducted with 43 parents representing both programs to determine the degree of their participation in school affairs, their preferences concerning curriculum emphasis at the kindergarten level, their assessment of their children's progress and their recommendations for the handling of specific behavior problems in the classroom.

3. The four teachers were interviewed to determine their responses to the same set of questions asked the parents and to obtain the teachers' own evaluation of their relationship with parents and aides, as well as the curriculum, and the children's progress.

4. Teachers' ratings of all children in their classes were obtained with respect to language skills, social-emotional development, and general first grade readiness.

5. Each child's language development was assessed on the basis of two measures: a) his spontaneous responses to a series of pictures and b) his ability to repeat verbatim sentences spoken in standard American and Negro dialect.

In addition to the procedures described above, members of the evaluation staff accompanied the all-day classes on trips, attended scheduled parent activities, and met with representatives of the parents' group, the principal of P. S. 101 and various officials of the New York Board of Education who were directly or indirectly associated with the program.

General Findings

Implementation of the Program. From the beginning of the year, the program was scheduled on an all-day (9:00 – 2:20) basis. Prior to the receipt of the funds in March, however, that was probably the only respect in which the program was actually functioning in accordance with the parents' original plans. The teachers were without classroom assistants and equipment and instructional materials were in short supply. Moreover, a number of changes in the teaching staff took place such that by the end of the year only one of the initial three teachers still remained.

Certain difficulties persisted even after the funds were allocated. The equipment and materials which were ordered at that time never arrived. Moreover, the parents' group charged with the responsibility for scheduling trips and parent activities was never given guidelines for spending the funds nor were the procedures for handling these funds fully outlined to them. As result of this miscommunication the parents experienced considerable inconvenience and several disappointments in carrying out their plans.

Nevertheless, the funds did permit the parents' group to arrange 17 bus trips and a number of other special activities for the children during the last three months of the program and several social activities for the parents. In addition, the hiring of paraprofessional personnel enabled the teachers to individualize their programs to a greater extent.

It must be recognized, however, that due primarily to delay in funding the program never fully operated according to the original objectives.

Teachers, Curriculum, and Equipment. Members of the evaluation staff who observed the teachers of the extended classes as well as two control teachers randomly selected from the regular kindergarten classes commented on the wide individual variation in the approaches and teaching techniques these teachers employed. They concluded, however, that the skill of the teachers in the experimental program was not substantially different from that of the others, and none of the four teachers was judged unsatisfactory. Furthermore, the curriculum presented in the two programs was quite similar. One exception, of course, was the greater number of bus trips and other excursions provided for the all day classes.

The teachers in the extended program were thoroughly acquainted with the curriculum recommendations put forth by the parents in their original proposal and did where possible attempt to incorporate them. In certain instances, however, the teachers felt that the suggested activities were not suitable for kindergarten children. Examples of this were the recommendations that map reading and counting to 100 be taught. For the most part, the parents accepted the teachers' judgments in these matters.

Although the level of teaching skill and nature of the curriculum evident in the all-day and regular classes were similar, differences were noted with respect to the physical facilities, materials, and equipment. In these respects, the all-day classes were operating at a disadvantage.

Parent-Teachers Attitudes and Participation. On the basis of interviews with parents whose children were in the all-day and half-day classes, the evaluation staff concluded that although the number of parent-teacher contacts in the two groups seemed to be similar, there was no question that the parents of the extended program participated to a greater extent in school affairs. Their participation included not only aiding in the implementation of the all-day program, but extended as well to activities such as the publishing of a school

newspaper and organizing fund raising projects which benefitted the entire school. Two of these parents in particular gave unstintingly of their time and efforts in furthering their educational goals for children in this community.

The parents who were interviewed in both the all day and regular programs almost without exception spoke favorably of the teachers and of the classes in which their children were enrolled. These interviews in conjunction with those held with teachers did, however, reveal two areas of disagreement. When asked to rank in order of importance for kindergarten children seven different curriculum areas, parents, particularly those in the extended program, selected learning to read as their first choice. Teachers, on the other hand, were more likely to consider social-emotional areas as the most critical and reading much less important. A second area of discrepancy concerned recommendations for handling hypothetical behavior problems. The parents typically recommended firmer disciplinary measures than did teachers particularly for those instances in which the child's behavior involved aggression, sex play, or use of socially unacceptable language.

These disagreements did not disrupt the generally harmonious relations which existed between the kindergarten parents and teachers at this school, but they did indicate the need for greater teacher-parent communications regarding these issues.

The Children's Performance. The results of two tests of language development administered to a sample of children in both programs indicated that those in the extended classes had greater familiarity with standard American speech and greater language fluency. Since, however, no information was available concerning the language facility of the children in September, it cannot be assumed that the greater facility of those in the all day classes was due to the nature of the program in which they were enrolled. Since a greater percentage of them had received pre-kindergarten schooling, they may have already been ahead of the other children at the beginning of the school year.

These children also attended school somewhat more frequently during a selected period than did children in the regular classes.

General Recommendations

Although the evaluation staff recognizes the potential merit of an extended school day for young children, it is recommended that subsequent experiments in this direction be based on more careful advance planning. In order to put a well coordinated educational program into effect, funds and guidelines for their use must be available before the onset of the school year. Discussions between parents and school officials regarding staffing, curriculum objectives, and other program plans must also take place at this time.

There were positive outcomes of the extended kindergarten program at P. S. 101 M, but the benefits would have been greatly increased had the parents and teachers been given the opportunity to actually put into effect in September the program they had planned.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION, October, 1968

To OFFICE OF URBAN EDUCATION, ALBANY

For EXTENDED KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM AT P. S. 101 M

1. Project Title:

   EXTENDED KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM – P. S. 101 M

2. Activity Title:

   EXTENDED KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM – with supportive services including health, nutrition, social services, and parental and community involvement.

3. Activity Objectives:

   3.1 To sustain and extend the school experience of children who have attended an all-day Head Start Program through the school year.

   3.2 To identify and develop children's learning styles through a wide variety of school experiences and exposure to a multi-media educational approach, with heavy emphasis on cognitive skills along with language development and mathematical and social concepts.

   3.3 To provide a comprehensive program of compensatory and advanced education that will involve each child in the context in which he sees himself, his home, his family, and his community, building on the experiences and skills gained in the Head Start year.

   3.4 To consult with and involve the parents of the children in planning and executing a program that is designed to meet the needs of the children, with the goal of anticipating and forestalling possible future learning problems.

4. Activity Description:

   Three kindergarten classes will be organized at Public School 101 M, with a register of 20 children in each class. Each child involved is a neighborhood child who has attended a year-long all-day Head Start program in the community. The community is in a poverty ghetto area.

The program will concern itself with cognitive skills, language and concept development, etc. Emphasis will be placed on the following curriculum areas: language arts, math, science, social studies, African and Puerto Rican cultures, music, art, health and physical education, family living and sex education.

Special multi-ethnic materials and approaches will be used, including films, filmstrips, pictures, realia, literature, listening and viewing centers, tape recorders, trips, etc.

Each class will be staffed by an experienced licensed early childhood Teacher, assisted by a Family Worker, a Teacher Aide, and an Educational Assistant.

The supportive services will include a Family Assistant and the part-time services of a social worker. Health services will be provided by the school physician and nurse. Nutritional services will be provided through a program of snacks and hot lunches served under the auspices of the Bureau of School Lunches. The schedule as planned will be an extended school day, running from 9 a.m. to 2:20 p.m. The entire staff, professional and paraprofessional, will work from 8:40 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., allowing one half hour from 2:30 to 3:00 p.m. for team planning, curriculum development, evaluation and staff conferences. On occasion, this ½ hour will be used for parent conferences and workshops. There will be a mid-morning and mid-afternoon snack. Lunch will be served at noon.

The Community Advisory Committee, which has already been functioning, will continue in an on-going consultative and supportive capacity. The members of this committee include some parents of the children involved. The plans for this program have been developed in collaboration with this community group.

Workshops, meetings, seminars, trips and classroom visits will be scheduled regularly for this group as well as for the entire parent body. Parent volunteers will participate in the early program with the two-fold purpose of helping and learning.

5. Target Group Served by Activity:

   5.1 Primary target group: 60 children who have previously attended an all-day community-based Head Start Program in District 4 M.

   5.2 Secondary target group: parents of the participating children, siblings of these children, and the community at large.

6. Activity Size Indicators: 60 kindergarten children.

7. Activity Effectiveness Measures: See Evaluation Design

8. Five-Year Projections for Funding:

	1967-8	1968-9	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72
State (Special Urban Education Aid).		$ 65,129			
State (other Aid – specify)					
Federal (specify) – ESEA-TITLE I		9,081			
Local		31,324			
Other (specify)		40,405			
TOTAL:		$145,939			

Function and Object	Amount per item per target group (identify each target group by code in space at top of column)					
	Target Group Code					Total Across
Instruction and Community Services						
Personal Services	$ 40,310					$ 40,310
Equipment	4,776					4,776
Supplies and Materials	3,300					3,300
Textbooks						
Other Expenses	3,000					3,000
Employee Benefits						
612 Teachers Retirement and Retirement Supplement 17.017	3,292					3,292
Employees Retirement						
Social Security – 48%	1,599					1,599
Health Insurance	2,160					2,160
Life Insurance – Union Welfare	380					380
Transportation						
Transportation of Pupils	1,050					1,050
Operation and Maintenance of Plant						
Rent for Buildings						
Food Services						
Food Service for Pupils	2,160					2,160
Total each column	$ 62,027					$ 62,027

Combined Total of columns	65,129
5% of combined totals	3,102
Total of State Urban Education Aid charged to this activity	$ 65,129

Approved and Submitted by:

(Superintendent of Schools)

Bernard E. Donovan – Supt. of Schools

Date

April, 1969 Revision of Estimated Budget

Submitted October, 1968

Equipment		October Entry	Revised Entry
Record Player	3 x $320	$ 960	$
Record Player	3 x $ 28	-0-	84
Slide Projectors	3 x $ 76	-0-	228
Instamatic Camera	3 x $ 20	-0-	60
Hot Plate	3 x $ 18.50	-0-	56
Primary Typewriters	2 x $113.85	-0-	228
Manual Typewriter	1 x $113.85	-0-	114
Food Carrier	4 x $ 20	-0-	80
Trays	8 x $ 1.90	-0-	16
Electric Typewriters	3 x $260	780	-0-
Television Receivers	2 x $159	-0-	318
Classroom Furniture		2,400	1,510
Refrigerator	1 x $200	-0-	200
Metal Closets	2 x $ 75	-0-	150
Cots-Aluminum & Canvas	40 x $ 13.50	-0-	540
	Total Equipment	$ 4,776	$ 3,584
	Decrease	$ 1,192	
Pupil Admission Fees		-0-	1,500
Total Other Expenses		3,000	4,500
	Increase		$ 1,500

Decrease	$ 27,376
5%	1,369
	$ 28,745
Prior Total	65,129
Total Decrease	28,745
NEW TOTAL	$ 36,384

Budget Revision (continued)

Personal Services	October Entry	Revised Entry
Teacher Assigned as Coordinator (1)	$ 11,775	$ -0-
School Secretary (1)	7,575	-0-
School Secretary – 1 x 750 hrs. x $5.35	-0-	4,013
School Social Worker – 1 x 282 hrs. x $10.75	3,032	-0-
Family Assistant – 1 x 1,728 hrs. x $2.50	4,320	-0-
Family Assistant – 1 x 594 hrs. x $2.50	-0-	1,485
Family Workers (3) – $1.75 x 3,888 hrs.	6,804	-0-
Family Workers (2) – $1.75 x 1,188 hrs.	-0-	2,079
Teacher Aides (3) – $1.75 x 3,888 hrs.	6,804	-0-
Teacher Aides (4) – $1.75 x 2,376 hrs.	-0-	4,158
Educational Assistant – 1 x 396 hrs. x $2.25	-0-	891
Total Personal Services	$ 40,310	$ 12,626
Decrease	$ 27,684	

ACTIVITY BUDGET DETAIL

A. Instructional and Community Services

Personal Services:

Target Group	Title	Rate of Pay	Amount of Time	Salary
1	Teacher assigned as coordinator	$ 11,775	1 year	$ 11,775
1	School Secretary	$ 7,575	1 year	7,575
1	Sch. Soc. Worker	10.75 per hr.	282 hrs.	3,032
1	Family Assistant	2.50 per hr.	1,728 hrs.	4,320
3	Family Workers	1.75 per hr.	3,888 hrs.	6,804
3	Teacher Aides	1.75 per hr.	3,888 hrs.	6.804

Salaries total: $ 40,310

Equipment:

Target Group	Name of Object	Quantity	Unit Cost	Expense
	Record Player	3	320	$ 960
	Tape Recorder	3	165	495
	Viewer Desk	3	47	141
	Typewriter Electric	3	260	780
	Classroom Furniture	3	800	2,400

Equipment Total: $ 4,776

Supplies and Materials:

Object	Expense
Instructional	$ 3,000
Clerical	300
Supplies and Materials Total:	$ 3,300

Other Expenses:

Object	Expense
Miscellaneous – Telephone $300; paper services $600	$ 900
Parent Activity Fund $1,800; Special Food $300	2,100
Other Expenses Total:	$ 3,000

C. Transportation (transportation of Pupils)

(1) Allowance for district owned buses	
(C) 10 x 3 X (A) $35	$ 1,050
(2) Private Carrier 510-451	
(3) Public Service Corp. 510-452	
Total transportation cost	$ 1,050

D. Operation and Maintenance of Plant $ -0-

E. Pupil Food Services:

(1) Estimated annual number of school lunches to be served to children of high school grade level or below	
(2) Estimated annual number of snacks to be served to children of high school grade level or below	$ 2,160
(3) Estimated number of school lunches to be served to out-of-school youth and adults	
Total Food Services estimated cost: (sum of (1) (2) (3)	$ 2,160

PLAN FOR EVALUATION OF PROGRAM

Introduction

The purpose of the present evaluation will be to study the effectiveness of the Extended Kindergarten Program during 1968-1969.

The full evaluation of this program will be carried on by a research agency to be selected which will work in cooperation with the Bureau of Educational Research of the New York City Board of Education. The basic objective of the evaluation will be to determine the effect of the program on the children in the cognitive, social, emotional and medical health areas.

The following is an outline for the evaluation of the program prepared by the Bureau of Educational Research, Board of Education, New York.

Activity Objectives:

1. To sustain and extend the school experience of children who have attended an all-day Head Start Program for a 12-month year – 1967-1968.
2. To identify and develop children's learning styles through a wide variety of school experiences and exposure to a multi-media educational approach.
3. To provide a comprehensive program of compensatory and advanced education that will involve each child in the context in which he sees himself.
4. To consult with and involve the parents of the children in planning and executing a program that is designed to meet the needs of the children. It is hoped that this will forestall a good proportion of possible future school difficulties.

Procedures of Evaluation

Objective 1

To describe the program and determine to what extent the blueprint of the project has been implemented.

a. Subjects: experimental and control pupils and teachers will be the subjects in this phase of the evaluation.

b. Method: official records and documents will be examined. Observation of the ongoing program will be made by qualified research experts. Key personnel will be interviewed.

c. Instrumentation: checklists and appropriate data forms will be used to transfer relevant administrative information from records. A rating schedule will be developed for use in classroom observations. An interview schedule will also be used.

d. Analysis: this basic descriptive data will be analyzed with totals, means, ranges, and other statistics to be utilized where appropriate.

e. Time schedule: the data will be drawn from administrative records during December, 1968 and April, 1969. Observations will be made in January, 1969 and March, 1969 and teachers will be interviewed in April, 1969.

Objective 2

To determine the effectiveness of instruction on the development of cognitive skills, language and concept development; areas included are language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, African and Puerto Rican culture, music, art, health and physical education, family living and sex education.

a. Subjects: experimental and control children.

b. Methods: (i) children will be tested by qualified examiners in small groups for language and cognitive development. (ii) children will be rated by instructional and supervisory personnel in the instructional areas.

c. Instrumentation: (i) a short battery made up of portions of various tests available for kindergarten children will be used. This battery will be an adapted version of the one to be used in the 1968-1969 national evaluation of the Follow Through Programs. (ii) rating scales will be developed for use by the teachers.

d. Analysis: non-parametric and parametric statistical comparison between groups

will be used according to the nature of the specific test materials used. Data will also be used to provide base line information for evaluation of any extension of this program into grades 1 and 2 in subsequent years.

e. Time schedule: testing will take place during the latter half of May, 1969.

Objective 3

To determine the level of attendance.

a. Subjects: experimental and control pupils.

b. Methods: official attendance records will be examined.

c. Instrumentation: data forms will be employed.

d. Analysis: comparison will be made of attendance levels for experimental and control kindergartens.

e. Time schedule: attendance for the entire year will be taken into consideration.

Objective 4

To determine the effectiveness of teacher performance toward meeting the needs of pupils in the Extended Kindergarten Program.

a. Subjects: experimental and control pupils and teachers.

b. Method: New York City Board of Education supervisors and/or qualified university specialists will observe and rate teacher performance.

c. Instrumentation: an objective multi-item rating scale will be used by the observers.

d. Analysis: ratings will be subjected to non-parametric statistical analysis for comparison of experimental and control classes. Qualitative ratings will supplement the objective checklist ratings.

e. Time schedule: each class will be observed several times over the course of the school year.

Objective 5

To determine the sufficiency, scope and appropriateness of instructional materials used for pupils in the Extended Kindergarten Program including those materials which depart from the usual scope and sequence in the regular kindergarten program.

a. Subject: experimental pupils.

b. Methods: New York City Board of Education curriculum specialists and/or qualified university specialists will be provided samples of instructional materials which are representative of the material used for pupils in the Extended Kindergarten Program. Special emphasis will be placed on assessing the use of multi-media approaches, multi-ethnic materials.

c. Instrumentation: using an objective checklist, materials will be rated in a variety of areas.

d. Analysis: percentages and other descriptive statistics will be utilized. Qualitative judgements will supplement the objective checklist ratings.

e. Time schedule: this portion of the investigation will take place in April and May, 1969.

Objective 6

To determine the role of supportive services for the program.

a. Subjects: social worker, family assistant, family workers and teacher aides.

b. Methods: questionnaires will be used to measure the views of the supportive personnel regarding their success in assisting the instructional and social learning process. Teachers and supervisors will also be asked to indicate their reactions.

c. Instrumentation: questionnaires and rating scales will be developed for all involved personnel.

d. Analysis: responses will be presented in tabular form with accompanying

discussion of implications.

e. Time schedule: questionnaires will be distributed during the first two weeks of June, 1969.

APPENDIX B: INSTRUMENTS

Tally Sheet

Teacher-Program Assessment

Interviewer _____

School _____

Date _____

Location _____

Teacher _____

Total Classroom Enrollment _____

Number Present on Day of Visit _____

Estimate Ethnic Breakdown of Those Present:

Negro _____ Puerto Rican _____ Other _____

Was Teacher's Aide Present Throughout the Day? _____

Other Adults Present? _____

If so, explain function _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

I. PHYSICAL SET-UP, EQUIPMENT, ROOM ARRANGEMENT

Type of Equipment	Absent	Present, but not in suitable quantity, quality, or accessibility	Present in satisfactory quantity, quality, or accessibility
INDOOR EQUIPMENT			
Language Equipment			
Tape recorder			
Story record			
Lotto games			
Telephones			
Puppets			
Flannel board			
Books			
Math Equipment			
Rulers			
Scales			
Number games			
Science Equipment			
Aquarium			
Plants, seeds, leaves, etc.			
Rocks, soil, shells, etc.			
Nests			
House-Play Equipment for:			
Eating			
Cooking			
Cleaning			
Child-care			
Dress-Up Clothes			
Wall mirror			
Doll house			
Animals			
Block Building and Accessories			
Building blocks			
Small vehicular toys			
Family figures			
Animals			
Wood Working Bench and Tools			
Music Equipment			
Rhythm instruments			
Song records			
Piano			
Teacher's instruments			

Type of Equipment	Absent	Present, but not in suitable quantity, quality, or accessibility	Present in satisfactory quantity, quality, or accessibility
Art Equipment			
Plastic arts (clay, etc.)			
Graphic arts (paints, crayons)			
Craft materials (scissors, paste, collage, etc.)			
Bulletin Board (or other facility for displaying children's work)			
Water-Play Equipment			
Basins, bowls, etc.			
Sponges, straws, etc.			
Funnels, strainers, etc.			
Manipulative Toys			
Puzzles			
Peg boards			
Beads, etc.			
Large Wheel Toys (of size children can sit on or ride in)			

Comments concerning indoor equipment: (Mention additional equipment of special interest such as typewriters, cash registers, Montessori toys, etc.)

OUTDOOR EQUIPMENT

Climbing apparatus			
Hauling equipment (wagons, wheel barrows, etc.)			
Large building blocks			
Ladders and boards			
Sandbox and accessories			
Other outdoor toys such as balls, jump ropes			
Size of Area	Inadequate	Marginal	Satisfactory
Freedom from safety hazard			
Accessibility to classroom			
Privacy of area for children (Isolated from other play groups)			

Comments concerning outdoor equipment:

Physical Condition of Classroom	Inadequate	Marginal	Satisfactory
Size of room			
Toilet facilities			
Lunch facilities (tables, plates, etc.)			
Aesthetic quality of room			
Sink in room			
Ventilation			
Resting facilities (cots, mats)			

Comments concerning physical conditions:

Room Arrangement:

1. Consider the physical conditions under which the teacher must work, and rate the suitability of her room arrangement.

most unsuitable 1 2 3 4 5 highly satisfactory

2. Consider the flexibility with which the teacher adapts the room for various purposes such as rest, lunch, etc.

inflexible 1 2 3 4 5 highly satisfactory

Comments concerning room arrangement:

Summary Rating:

Consider the over-all physical set-up, equipment, and room arrangement and indicate a summary rating.

most unsatisfactory 1 2 3 4 5 highly satisfactory

II. PROGRAM

Intellectual Aspect	Not Present	Present, but Inadequately Handled	Present, and Adequately Handled
Language Development			
Formally structured language exercises, games, or drills			
Informal, less structured language games or experiences (group discussions)			
Reading of stories, singing songs			
Providing opportunities for children to talk throughout day. (Does not mean active encouragement of speech – just permitting it to occur.)			
Active encouragement and stimulation of children's speech.			

Listen to teacher's speech (articulation, grammar, accent not content). Rate her as a suitable language model for young children.

most unsuitable 1 2 3 4 5 highly suitable

Repeat this judgment with respect to speech of classroom aid.

most unsuitable 1 2 3 4 5 highly suitable

Repeat this judgment with respect to speech of educational assistant

most unsuitable 1 2 3 4 5 highly suitable

Observe teacher's interaction with non-English speaking children. To what extent does she actively encourage use of English through any means.

no encouragement 1 2 3 4 5 high encouragement

Repeat this rating with respect to the teacher's aide

no encouragement 1 2 3 4 5 high encouragement

Comments concerning language aspect of program:

Intellectual Aspect	Absent	Present, but Inadequately Handled	Present, and Adequately Handled
Natural Sciences			
Formally structured demonstrations or lessons			
Informal opportunities provided by teacher for children to acquaint themselves with natural science materials and concepts			

Comments concerning natural science aspects:

Intellectual Aspect	Absent	Present, but Inadequately Handled	Present and Adequately Handled
Math			
Quantitative Concepts			
Formally structured math exercises or demonstrations			
Informal opportunities provided for children to acquaint themselves with number concepts such as counting juice cups, etc.			

Comments concerning quantitative aspects of program:

Intellectual Aspect	Absent	Present, but Inadequate	Present and Adequate
Social Studies Concepts			
Formally structured demonstration, activities			
Informally structured activities			

Comments:

Summary Rating:

Intellectual aspect of program

non-existent	1	2	3	4	5	highly emphasized

Social-Emotional Aspect of Program

To what degree does teacher stimulate the growth of positive human relationships?

low 1 2 3 4 5 high degree

How confident are you of this judgment?

low confidence 1 2 3 4 5 high confidence

What evidence can you cite in support of your rating?

To what extent does teacher help child to understand his own motives and those of other people?

low degree 1 2 3 4 5 high degree

How confident are you of this judgment?

low confidence 1 2 3 4 5 high confidence

What evidence can you cite in support of your rating?

To what degree does teacher promote children's self-esteem?

low degree 1 2 3 4 5 high degree

How confident are you of this rating?

low confidence 1 2 3 4 5 high confidence

What evidence can you cite to support your rating?

To what degree does the teacher help the child channel his feelings in appropriate ways?

low degree 1 2 3 4 5 high degree

How confident are you of this rating?

low confidence 1 2 3 4 5 high confidence

What evidence can you cite in support of this rating?

Summary Rating:

Social-emotional aspect of program – How effective is this teacher in promoting the social-emotional development of her children?

not very effective 1 2 3 4 5 very effective

Creative Aspects of Program	Not Present	Present, but Inadequately Handled	Present and Adequately Handled
Musical Activities (singing, listening to records, rhythms, dance)			
Comment on types and nature of the activities: spontaneous			
structured			
Creative Dramatics (using music, literature, puppets, pantomime, etc.)			
Comment on types and nature of activities: spontaneous			
structured			
Art (drawing, painting, crafts, sculpture, etc.)			
Comment on media used, types of activities: spontaneous			
structured			

Summary Rating:

Creative aspects

unstimulating 1 2 3 4 5 stimulating

Motor Development	No Provision	Provided, but Inadequate	Adequately Provided
Provides opportunities for fine motor activity			
Provides opportunities for coarse motor activity			

Comments:

Summary Rating:

Check which of the following appears to be the main focus of this program:

_____ Intellectual development

_____ Social-emotional development

_____ Motor development

_____ No focus apparent

Health-Safety

To what extend does this teacher in her handling of toileting and eating routines, as well as play activities, promote appropriate attitudes and practices with respect to health and safety.

low degree 1 2 3 4 5 high degree

Comments:

Ethnic Identification	Not Present	Present but Inadequate	Present and Adequate
Representation of minority groups in dolls, books, and pictures in classrooms			
Use of ethnic material in songs and stories			

Minority Group Representation Among Staff	N	PR	W	Chinese	Male	Female
Teacher						
Teacher Aide(s)						

III. TEACHER'S RELATIONSHIP WITH STAFF, PARENTS, AND CHILDREN

Aides

The teacher is expected to work as a team with her aides, to integrate them effectively into the program. They are not to be used solely for clean-up or other menial tasks. To what extent do this teacher and her aides work as a team?

no evidence of team work 1 2 3 4 5 smoothly functioning team

How confident are you of this rating?

low confidence 1 2 3 4 5 high confidence

Evidence for this rating:

Relationship with Parents

Observe any interaction with parents and evaluate the teacher's ability to greet them in positive manner and her contact with them to comment on children's progress, and to elicit their interest in the program.

ineffective parent contacts 1 2 3 4 5 highly effective contacts

How confident do you feel of this rating?

low confidence 1 2 3 4 5 high confidence

What evidence can you cite for this rating?

Teacher's Relationship with Children

Consider the following means of positive and negative reinforcement. Indicate the relative frequency with which the teacher uses them.

Negative Reinforcement offering explanations or reasons citing standards or expectations	No Use	Occasional Use	Frequent Use
uses of word shame			
removing from group			
ignoring			
depriving of objects			
depriving of privilege			
threats			
scolding			
saying child has disappointed teacher			
saying child has disappointed group			
frowing or looks of disapproval			
threatening to withdraw affection			
moralizing			
calling on outside authority			
pointing out child as bad example			
physical restraint			
other means			

What is teacher's main means of negative reinforcement?

Positive Reinforcement	No Use	Occasional Use	Frequent Use
praises			
smiles or nods			
pointing out child as good example			
patting, or other physical contact			
granting special privileges			
granting material rewards			
saying child has pleased teacher			
indicating that child has pleased group			
other means			

What is teacher's main means of positive reinforcement?

To what extent does the teacher show evidence of favoritism?

no evidence 1 2 3 4 5 considerable evidence

To what extent does the teacher encourage peer interaction?

no encouragement 1 2 3 4 5 considerable encouragement

Comments concerning child-teacher interaction:

Summary Rating:

The Program

structured	1	2	3	4	5	non-structured
teacher's centered	1	2	3	4	5	child centered

Teacher's behavior

flexible	1	2	3	4	5	rigid
highly verbal	1	2	3	4	5	minimally verbal
directive	1	2	3	4	5	non-directive
warm	1	2	3	4	5	cold
stimulating	1	2	3	4	5	unstimulating

Comments (If possible discuss with teachers):

TEACHER RATINGS

Please rate the children in your classes on the following traits using the five point scale described below each trait. In making the ratings, consider the child in relation to others in his class.

I. English Language skills. Consider the fluency of the child's spoken English, his vocabulary, grammar and articulation.

1. High degree of skill with spoken English.
2. Above average degree of skill for children in this class.
3. About average degree of skill for children in this class. English skills adequate for school requirements.
4. Some spoken English, but below average for children in this class and below school requirements.
5. Virtually no spoken English.

II. Social-Emotional Adjustment. Consider the way in which the child relates to adults and to other children and his adjustment to school routines.

1. Exceptionally well adjusted child.
2. Better adjusted than the average child in this class.
3. Adjustment about average for children in this class.
4. Has more than the average number of problems of a social-emotional nature.
5. Has social-emotional difficulties which may be serious.

III. Readiness for First Grade. Consider the degree of the child's preparation for first grade from a social-emotional as well as academic point of view.

1. Unusually well prepared for first grade.
2. Better prepared than most children in this class.
3. Readiness for first grade about average for children in this class.
4. Less well prepared than most children in the class, but may get by.
5. Preparation not yet adequate; very likely to encounter problems next year.

TEACHER INTERVIEW

I. Learning Emphasis

I have written on these cards some things that children learn in kindergarten. You will probably think that some are more important than others.

1. Tell me which one is most important of all for a child to learn in kindergarten.
2. (Remove chosen card) Now, of the rest which is most important for a child to learn in kindergarten.
3. (Remove chosen card) Mrs. X, you have told me which of these were most important. Now can you tell me which is the very <u>least</u> important for a child to learn in kindergarten.
4. (Remove chosen card) And of the rest which is the <u>least</u> important for a child to learn.

Interviewer – Indicate choices below with 1, 2, 3, or 4 (1 most – 4 least).

_____Learning to read.

_____Learning about numbers.

_____Learning to get along with other children.

_____Learning to paint, sing, and dance.

_____Learning how to behave in school.

_____Learning how to say new words and to speak well.

_____Learning about science – plants, animals, the sun, the earth and the sky.

5a. You have selected (1st choice) as the most important thing a child can learn in kindergarten. Can you tell me why you chose that one?

5b. Lets's think back to September. As far as (1st choice) is concerned, how much would you say your class has progressed since then on the whole?

_____not very much

_____quite a bit

_____a great deal

5c. As far as (1st choice) is concerned), how well prepared for first grade do you think your class is on the whole?

_____very well prepared

_____prepared about as well as most classes would be

_____many will probably have trouble in (1st choice)

5d. Let's think about the amount of time you spent on (1st choice) in kindergarten this year. Do you think it was:

_____ too much

_____just about right

_____not enough

5e. How would you rate the kind of job you have done this year as far as (1st choice) is concerned?

_____ poor

_____fair

_____ good

5f. Let's think about first grade again. How well prepared do you think your class will be not just in (1st choice) but in everything children need for first grade?

_____very well

_____prepared about as well as most classes would be

_____many will probably have trouble

II. Control of Behavior

I am going to read you some stories that have been made up about things that might happen in kindergarten. In reading them I will mention children's names but these have been made up too and don't stand for any children in this kindergarten. Here's the first one:

1. Tom is always fighting. He is bigger than the other children and seems to frighten them with his loud talk and rough manner. One day, the teacher sees Tom hit another child and goes over to talk to him. When the teacher asks Tom what he is fighting about, Tom answers, "nothing" and kicks the teacher in the leg.

A. Should a teacher do anything about this?

Yes_____ No._____

B. What would you do as a teacher in a case like this?

C. What do you think the parents of the children in your class would have wanted you to do in a case like this?

2. Joseph uses dirty words at school. He greets the teacher with a four letter word in the morning and uses bad words when talking to the other children. The other children are starting to copy him.

A. Should the teacher do anything about it?

Yes_____ No_____

B. What would you do as a teacher in a case like this?

C. What do you think the parents of the children in your class would have wanted you to do in a case like this?

3. One day, while Joseph and Maria were playing in the corner, the teacher saw Joseph looking under Maria's dress and giggling. On another day, Joseph was seen peeking into girls' bathroom.

A. Should the teacher do anything about it?

Yes_____ No _____

B. What would you do as a teacher in a case like this?

C. What do you think the parents of the children in your class would have wanted you to do in a case like this?

4. Juan often blames things he does on other children. Today the teacher sees Juan spill a jar of paint. When she asks him to clean it up, he says that Rose did it.

A. Should the teacher do anything about it?

Yes_____ No_____

B. What would you do as a teacher in a case like this?

C. What do you think the parents of the children in your class would have wanted you to do in a case like this?

5. Robert has just given the teacher his writing lesson, but the paper is messy and smudged. Robert's work is usually messy, and although he comes to school clean, by the end of the day his hands, face, and clothing are dirty.

   A. Do you think the teacher should do anything about it?

   Yes _____ No _____

   B. What would you do as a teacher in a case like this?

   C. What do you think the parents of the children in your class would have wanted you to do in a case like this?

6. Mary is very quiet and does not join in the classroom activities. She does not play with the other children and seldom talks to anyone. If she is left alone, Mary will sit by herself watching the class.

   A. Should the teacher do anything about it?

   Yes _____ No _____

   B. What would you do as a teacher in a case like this?

   C. What do you think the parents of the children in your class would have wanted you to do in a case like this?

7. Ramon is a child who reports to the teacher what the other children are doing. When someone in the group is hitting or pushing, he tells the teacher about this. Today the children were pushing in line and Ramon ran to tell the teacher.

   A. Should the teacher do anything about it?

   Yes _____ No _____

   B. What would you do as a teacher in a case like this?

   C. What do you think the parents of the children in your class would have wanted you you to do in a case like this?

8. Maria finds it hard to do things by herself. She is always looking for someone to help her. For instance, she won't start to paint unless the teacher stands nearby and encourages her. If the teacher is busy, she asks someone else to help her.

   A. Should a teacher do anything about this?

   Yes _____ No _____

B. What would you do as a teacher in a case like this?

C. What do you think the parents of the children in your class would have wanted you to do in a case like this?

III. Educational Attitudes

Now, I would like to read some statements to you about schools and teachers, and ask you how much you agree or disagree with each one. Please tell me if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with each one. (Do not read "don't know" response)

	1 Strongly Agree	2 Agree	3 Don't know	4 Disagree	5 Strongly Disagree
1. Most teachers probably like quiet children better than active ones.					
2. As a parent there is very little I can do to improve the schools.					
3. Most teachers do not want to be bothered by parents coming to see them.					
4. In school there are more important things than getting good grades.					
5. The best way to improve the schools is to train teachers better.					
6. Once in a while it should be OK for parents to keep their children out of school to help out at home.					
7. Teachers who are very friendly are not able to control the children.					
8. The teachers make the children doubt and question things that they are told at home.					
9. When children do not work hard in school, the parents are to blame.					
10. Most children have to be made to learn.					

IV. ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

I. Curriculum Experiences

1. I would like to discuss with you the area of _____ , which you indicated earlier was the area that you felt was most important for kindergarten children to learn. What did you hope the children would learn in this area this year?

2. To what extent has the children's performance met your expectations?

3. Can you give me an example of an activity you presented in this area that seemed particularly successful? Why was it so successful?

4. Can you give me an example of an activity you introduced in this area which wasn't as successful as you had hoped it would be? What went wrong?

5. Let's discuss another area, _____ . (To interviewer: indicate an area different from choice discussed in question 1. If teacher spoke about social-emotional development for that question, ask about academic area of her choice for this question and vice versa.) What did you hope the children would learn in this area this year?

6. To what extent has the children's performance met your expectations?

7. Can you give me an example of an activity you presented in this area that seemed particularly successful? Why was it so successful?

8. Can you give me an example of an activity you introduced in this area which wasn't as successful as you had hoped it would be? What went wrong?

9. As you look back on the year now, what is the main area in which the children have made progress?

10. What is the area in which you have had the least success. What is the reason for this?

11. In thinking ahead to next year, is there anything which you might want to change on the basis of what happened this year?

12. Do you follow any particular curriculum guide in making your plans?

13. How would you say the children you had this year compared to those you have had in the past as far as learning is concerned?

Equipment

1. To what extent, if any, was your program hampered by lack of equipment?
2. What equipment did you need?

Relations with Aides

1. Some teachers find classroom aides very helpful; others say that they are of limited use. How did this work out in your class?
2. If you had your choice concerning the aides you would work with next year, how many of this year's group would you choose?

Relations with Parents

1. How frequently in the past month have parents come on their own to see you about special problems?
2. How frequently in the past month have you asked a parent to come to see you or arranged to see her yourself?
3. How many of the parents of your children would you know by name?
4. (For regular class teachers only) How many parents accompanied the class on the trip last week?

For Extended Kindergarten Teachers Only

1. One of the main benefits of the funding which became available in March was that it enabled your class to go on trips. How many did you go on altogether since March?
2. To what places were trips planned?
3. To what extent was it possible to integrate these trips into the curriculum?
4. The parents committee drew up a curriculum guide for this program a year ago. How much did you follow this guide in your planning?
5. I would like to mention several items from that guide and ask to what extent these were accomplished this year.

a. Counting to 100
b. Phonics
c. Telling time on the hour and half hour
d. Recognizing continents, rivers, lakes, on the map
e. African and Puerto Rican culture

6. This program because of special funding enabled you to have a longer school day, more classroom aides, and special activities, but it was also an experiment in parent-teacher cooperation in implementing a program. Is there anything you would like to comment on concerning this latter point?

7. On the basis of your experience this year, what are your feelings about the desirability of an all-day program for children of this age?

Background Information

1. May I conclude by asking you what your educational experience has been? (degree, year, major, institution)

2. Please describe your previous teaching experience (grade, school, years taught)

3. Have you ever worked in a field other than teaching?

4. What are your plans for next year?

PARENT INTERVIEW

I. Learning Emphasis

I have written on these cards some things that children learn in kindergarten. You will probably think that some are more important than others.

1. Tell me which one is most important of all for a child to learn in kindergarten.
2. (Remove chosen card) Now, of the rest which is most important for a child to learn in kindergarten.
3. (Remove chosen card) Mrs. X, you have told me which of these were most important. Now can you tell me which is the very least important for a child to learn in kindergarten.
4. (Remove chosen card) And of the rest which is the least important for a child to learn.

Interviewer – Indicate choices below with 1, 2, 3, or 4 (1 most – 4 least).

_____Learning to read.

_____Lerning about numbers.

_____Learning to get along with other children.

_____Learning to paint, sing, and dance.

_____Learning how to behave in school.

_____Learning how to say new words and to speak well.

_____Learning about science – plants, animals, the sun, the earth and the sky.

5a. You have selected (1st choice) as the most important thing a child can learn in kindergarten, Mrs. X. Can you tell me why you chose that one?

5b. Let's think back to September. As far as (1st choice) is concerned, how much would you say your child has learned since then?

_____not very much

_____quite a bit

_____a great deal

Learning Emphasis (continued)

5c. As far as (1st choice) is concerned, how well prepared for first grade do you think your child is?

_____very well prepared

_____not prepared as well as some children, but should be able to get along

_____will probably have trouble in (1st choice)

5d. Let's think about the amount of time that was spent on (1st choice) in kindergarten this year. Do you think it was:

_____too much

_____just about right

_____not enough

5e. What kind of job would you say your child's teacher has done this year as far as (1st choice) is concerned?

_____poor

_____fair

_____good

5f. Let's think about first grade again. (how well prepared do you think your child will be not just in (1st choice) but in everything a child needs for first grade?

_____very well

_____not as well as some children but will get along all right

_____will probably have trouble

II. Control of Behavior

I am going to read you some stories that have been made up about things that might happen in kindergarten. In reading them I will mention children's names but these have been made up too and don't stand for any children in this kindergarten. Here's the first one:

1. Tom is always fighting. He is bigger than the other children and seems to frighten them with his loud talk and rough manner. One day, the teacher sees Tom hit another child and goes over to talk to him. When the teacher asks Tom what he is fighting about, Tom answers, "Nothing" and kicks the teacher in the leg.

A. Should a teacher do anything about this?

Yes _____ No _____

B. What do you think a teacher should do in a case like this?

C. Would your child's teacher have done that or would she have handled it in a different way?

2. Joseph uses dirty words at school. He greets the teacher with a four letter word in the morning and uses bad words when talking to the other children. The other children are starting to copy him.

A. Should the teacher do anything about it?

Yes _____ No _____

B. What do you think a teacher should do in a case like this?

C. Would your child's teacher have done that or would she have handled it a different way?

3. One day, while Joseph and Maria were playing in the corner, the teacher saw Joseph looking under Maria's dress and giggling. On another day, Joseph was seen peeking into girls' bathroom.

A. Should the teacher do anything about it?

Yes _____ No _____

B. What do you think a teacher should do in a case like this?

C. Would your child's teacher have done that or would she have handled it a different way?

4. Juan often blames things he does on other children. Today the teacher sees Juan spill a jar of paint. When she asks him to clean it up, he says that Rose did it.

A. Should the teacher do anything about it?

Yes _____ No _____

B. What do you think a teacher should do in a case like this?

C. Would your child's teacher have done that or would she have handled it a different way?

5. Robert has just given the teacher his writing lesson, but the paper is messy and smudged. Robert's work is usually messy, and although he comes to school clean, by the end of the day his hands, face, and clothing are dirty.

   A. Do you think the teacher should do anything about it?

   Yes_____ No_____

   B. What do you think a teacher should do in a case like this?

   C. Would your child's teacher have done that or would she have handled it a different way?

6. Mary is very quiet and does not join in the classroom activities. She does not play with the other children and seldom talks to anyone. If she is left alone, Mary will sit by herself watching the class.

   A. Should the teacher do anything about it?

   Yes_____ No_____

   B. What do you think a teacher should do in a case like this?

   C. Would your child's teacher have done that or would she have handled it differently?

7. Ramon is a child who reports to the teacher what the other children are doing. When someone in the group is hitting or pushing, he tells the teacher about this. Today the children were pushing in line and Ramon ran to tell the teacher.

   A. Should the teacher do anything about it?

   Yes_____ No_____

   B. What do you think a teacher should do in a case like this?

   C. Would your child's teacher have done that or would she have handled it differently?

8. Maria finds it hard to do things by herself. She is always looking for someone to help her. For instance, she won't start to paint unless the teacher stands nearby and encourages her. If the teacher is busy, she asks someone else to help her.

   A. Should a teacher do anything about this?

   Yes_____ No_____

B. What do you think a teacher should do in a case like this?

C. Would your child's teabher have done that or would she have handled it a different way?

III. Educational Attitudes

Now, I would like to read some statements to you about schools and teachers, and you you how much you agree or disagree with each one. Please tell me if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with each one. (Do not read "don't know" response)

	1 Strongly Agree	2 Agree	3 Don't know	4 Disagree	5 Strongly Disagree
1. Most teachers probably like quiet children better than active ones.					
2. As a parent there is very little I can do to improve the schools.					
3. Most teachers do not want to be bothered by parents coming to see them.					
4. In school there are more important things than getting good grades.					
5. The best way to improve the schools is to train teachers better.					
6. Once in a while it should be OK for parents to keep their children out of school to help out at home.					
7. Teachers who are very friendly are not able to control the children.					
8. The teachers make the children doubt and question things that they are told at home.					
9. When children do not work hard in school, the parents are to blame.					
10. Most children have to be made to learn.					

IV. Parent Evaluation of Program

1a. Mrs. X, did you have a chance to meet your child's teacher this year?

Yes_____ No_____

1b. How did this come about?

1c. How many times did you see the teacher?

1d. Do you think she is interested in helping your child to learn?

1e. What happened that makes you feel this way?

1f. Do you think she is interested in what you as a parent has to say about what is going on in school?

1g. What has happened to make you feel this way?

2a. Mrs. X., did you have a chance to go to any of the formal meetings the parents had to plan and talk about what went on at the school?

2b. How many did you go to?

2c. Can you tell me what happened at one of the meetings?

2d. Did you have a chance to make your feelings heard?

2e. What happened that makes you feel this way?

2f. Do you think most of the other parents had a chance to make their feelings heard?

2g. What happened that makes you feel this way?

(FOR PARENTS IN EXTENDED PROGRAM ONLY)

3a. How about the recreational activities the parents have had since the money came in March? Did you have a chance to go to any of these?

3b. How many have you gone to?

3c. Did you have a chance to help plan these activities?

3d. (If yes) Tell me about some of the things you did.

3e. Did the other parents all have a chance to plan these activities?

3f. Can you give me an example of why you feel that way.

(FOR ALL PARENTS)

4. Is there anything you feel it is important for us to know that we haven't talked about?

Comments by Interviewer:

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Test of Linguistic Flexiblilty

Child listens as speaker familiar with both standard English and Negro dialect reads the sentence. The child repeats the sentence immediately afterward.

1. She aks me did I take Henry ball
2. Where is Mary going with her friend's bike?
3. The teacher gave him a note and he is going to take it home.
4. He dog black with white spots.
5. My aunt who lives in New York has no children.
6. The ol' man who live here ain't got no money.
7. She asked me if I took Henry's ball.
8. He was late because he stopped at the store.
9. When the teacha aks Henry did he do his homework, Henry say, "I ain' did it."
10. My aunt she lives in New York and she ain' got no chil'run.
11. His dog is black with white spots.
12. Where Mary goin' wif her fren bike?
13. He be late cause he stop at the store.
14. When the teacher asked if he had done his homework Henry said, "I didn't do it."
15. That girl, a waitress, she be workin' three day a week.
16. The old man who lives here has no money.
17. The teacha give him a note an he gonna take it home.
18. That girl is working as a waitress three days a week.

APPENDIX C

PROJECT PERSONNEL

Investigators

Carol Millsom, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Division of Early Childhood and Elementary Education, New York Univeristy.

Marjorie Friedberg, Ed.D., Assistant Professor, Division of Early Childhood and Elementary Education, New York University.

Angela Jagger, M.A., Instructor, Division of Early Childhood and Elementary Education, New York University.

Stephen Weiss, M.A., Instructor, Division of Early Childhood and Elementary Education, New York University.

Margaret Ramsay, M.A., Doctoral Candidate, Division of Early Childhood and Elementary Education, New York University.

Dorothy Strickland, M.A., Doctoral Candidate, Division of Early Childhood and Elementary Education, New York University.

Staff

Lynne Schwartz, John Dawkins, David Ridenour; Interviewers.

Sylvia Mandel; Clerical Assistant